

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

10 STEVEN DARBY MCDONALD,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 KENNETH LAUREN, et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:17-cv-05013-RBL-

DWC

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
IMMEDIATE RULING

15
16 Plaintiff Steven Darby McDonald, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this
17 civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for
18 Immediate Ruling on Request for Preliminary Injunction ("Motion"). Dkt. 73.

19 Plaintiff asks the Court to immediately rule on his Motion for Preliminary Injunction
20 because the Court renoted that motion to give the Chief Judge time to rule on two other pending
21 motions, and the Chief Judge has now ruled on those motions. Local Civil Rule 7 states "[a]ll
22 motions will be decided as soon as practicable, and normally within thirty days following the
23 noting date." LCR 7(b)(5). Further, "[t]he [C]ourt may renote a pending motion to ensure
24

1 compliance with applicable court rules or for other reasons.” LCR 7(l). Parties should only
2 contact the Court regarding a decision on a motion “if a decision on the motion has not been
3 received within forty-five days of the noting date.” LCR 7(b)(5).

4 Here, the Court is not acting inappropriately by considering Plaintiff’s Motion for
5 Preliminary Injunction based on its noting date. The Court’s decision is not overdue. The Court
6 renoted the Motion for Preliminary Injunction to December 1, 2017. Though the Chief Judge has
7 rendered his decision on two other pending motions, the noting date has not changed. Plaintiff
8 should expect a decision within thirty days from the noting date and the Court has not acted
9 improperly by waiting to issue a decision until the Court has considered all allegations in the
10 motion. Therefore, Plaintiff’s Motion (Dkt. 73) is denied.

11 Dated this 20th day of November, 2017.

12 
13

14 David W. Christel
United States Magistrate Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24